

**VIRGINIA  
CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE  
REPORT:  
Part II**

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2002-2003**



**DUE JUNE 30, 2004**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
General Instructions and Timelines	vi
Cover Page for Submission	vii
Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)	1
William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)	5
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	18
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	29
Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)	30
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)	31
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)	32
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)	33
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)	35
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)	40
Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)	41
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)	45
Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)	47

# INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

- **Performance Goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

- **Performance Goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by spring 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report, which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. Additionally, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by highly-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore, performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

- Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.32 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

	OMB Number: _____ Expiration Date: _____
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Commonwealth of Virginia	
Address: Virginia Department of Education Office of Program Administration and Accountability P.O. Box 2120 Richmond, VA 23218-2120	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Dr. Linda M. Wallinger, Director, Office of Program Administration and Accountability	
Telephone: (804) 225-2869	
Fax: (804) 371-7347	
e-mail: <a href="mailto:lwalling@mail.vak12ed.edu">lwalling@mail.vak12ed.edu</a>	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Superintendent of Public Instruction	
_____ Signature	_____ June 28, 2004 Date



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I. Improving Basic Programs</b> <b>Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)</b></p>
---

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 578

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. 592

**B. Title I, Part A, Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State	<u>794</u>
2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State	<u>508</u>
3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State	<u>286</u>

### C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

#### 1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A, by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A, in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I Schoolwide and Targeted Assistance Programs.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	23,469
Limited English Proficient	11,115
Homeless	2,186
Migrant	318

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group</b>	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	395
Asian	4,493
Black or African American	90,760
Hispanic or Latino	13,633
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	9
White	62,119
Unspecified	942

## 2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A, student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS), Title I Schoolwide *Programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0		0	0	0.00%
Age 3-5	0	0		0	0	0.00%
PK	147	4,758		0	4,905	2.87%
K	3,783	19,118		23	22,924	13.43%
1	7,164	18,906		21	26,091	15.28%
2	6,483	19,070		38	25,591	14.99%
3	5,753	19,087		61	24,901	14.59%
4	3,963	19,042		26	23,031	13.49%
5	3,594	18,318		24	21,936	12.85%
6	568	6,594		194	7,356	4.31%
7	447	4,598		242	5,287	3.10%
8	237	3,567		246	4,050	2.37%
9	1	1,458		352	1,811	1.06%
10	0	1,005		130	1,135	0.66%
11	0	726		56	782	0.46%
12	0	755		17	772	0.45%
Ungraded	0	7		103	110	0.06%
PG	0	17		0	17	0.01%
<b>TOTALS</b>	32,140	137,026	0	1,533	170,699	100.00%

### 3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, Part A, in Targeted Assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services</b>	
<b>Instructional Services</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	9,075
Reading/Language Arts	29,208
Science	N/A
Social Studies	N/A
Vocational/Career	N/A
Other (specify)	N/A
<b>Support Services</b>	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	112
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	645
Other (specify)	0

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, Part A, Targeted Assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both Targeted Assistance and Schoolwide Program schools, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

<b>Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs</b>		
		Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)		51.16
Teachers		1036.60
Teacher Aides		406.06
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)		78.57
Other (specify)		21.7
Division Reading Specialist	.33	
Enrollment Facilitator	.50	
Family Services Specialist	1.00	
Home School Coordinator	2.40	
Parent Involvement Coordinator	8.85	
Unspecified	8.62	

<b>II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)</b>
---

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State	14
---	----

**2. Even Start Families Served**

a. Total number of families served	353
------------------------------------	-----

b. Total number of adults participating	371
---	-----

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners	52
---	----

d. Total number of children participating	501
---	-----

**3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

a. Number of newly enrolled families	266
--------------------------------------	-----

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	297
--	-----

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the Federal Poverty level	76%
--	-----

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED	78%
---	-----

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	42%
---	-----

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

a. Less than 3 months	22%
-----------------------	-----

b. From 4 to 6 months	20%
-----------------------	-----

c. From 7 to 12 months	22%
------------------------	-----

d. More than 12 months	36%
------------------------	-----

## B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under Section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under Section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target  2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.

Indicator	Target or Standards	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
Number and percentage of adult participants that improved their reading scores in English on the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) from the initial to the second administration of the test.	At least 75% of the adult participants will improve their reading scores from initial to second administration of the test.	TABE	#: 172 46%  previous year 72%	Target not met in 7 of 12 reporting locations. Four locations had 86% or more adults improving; most locations indicated improvement.	The low percentage improving results from some locations including all adults who started the program as the denominator to calculate the percentage, which would include adults who started but did not remain in the program to be post-tested. Only 32% of the adults participated at least 12 months.
Number and percentage of adult participants that increased their reading scores in English on the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) by one grade level from the initial to the second administration of the test.	At least 50% of the adult participants will increase their reading scores by one grade level from initial to second administration of the test.	TABE	#: 152 42%  previous year 43%	Target not met in 3 of 12 reporting locations. Positive movement in many locations from the previous year.	The low percentage improving results from some locations including all adults who started the program as the denominator to calculate the percentage, which would include adults who started but did not remain in the program to be post-tested. Only 32% of the adults participated at least 12 months.

Indicator	Target or Standards	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
Number and percentage of adults participating in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes for adults who wish to acquire English-speaking skills.	Participation in one or more ESL classes for adults who wish to acquire English-speaking skills.	Attending at least one class	#: 32 100%	Target met.	
Number and percentage of adult participants who improved their mathematics scores on the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) from the initial to the second administration of the test.	At least 75% of the adult participants will improve their math scores from initial to second administration of the test.	TABE	#: 185 60%  previous year 73%	Target not met in 6 of 13 reporting locations. Many locations indicated that improvements were found compared to the previous year. Two locations had 70%. Several indicated that those who completed the program were successful.	The low percentage improving results from some locations including all adults who started the program as the denominator to calculate the percentage, which would include adults who started but did not remain in the program to be post-tested. Only 32% of the adults participated at least 12 months.
Number and percentage of the adult participants who increased their mathematics scores on the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE) by one grade level from the initial to the second administration of the test.	At least 50% of the adult participants will increase their math scores by one grade level from initial to second administration of the test.	TABE	#: 174 56%  previous year 77%	Target met. Improvement noted from the previous year for most locations.	The data show that adults staying in the program a sufficient number of months were most successful. The percentage would be higher if only adults completing 12 or more months were used for the denominator.



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target or Standards</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
Number and percentage of adults who improved their educational status (e.g., high school graduation, GED certificate).	Improvement in the adults' educational status.	Completion rates	#: 82 21%  previous year 12%	No specific target. Current year showed a marked improvement from 2001-2002.	Those that remain in the program have the greatest opportunity for success. Many who did not meet the goal made progress toward meeting the goal.
Number and percentage of adults entering postsecondary school or other advanced education or training.	Entry in postsecondary school or other advanced education or training.	Completion rates	#: 45 18%  previous year 20%	No specific target. Four programs showed percentages above the previous year.	Those that remain in the program have the greatest opportunity for success. Many who did not meet the goal made progress toward the goal.
Number and percentage of adults showing improvement in the adults' self-sufficiency (e.g., employment, income, welfare participation).	Improvement in adults' self-sufficiency (e.g., employment, income, welfare participation).	Improvement rates.	#: 239 62%	No specific target or data from previous years. Found to be a difficult variable to quantify.	Those that remain in the program have the greatest opportunity for success in a variety of areas. Many who did not meet the goal made progress toward the goal.

Indicator	Target or Standards	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
Number and percentage of child participants between the ages of 3 and 5 years who improved sufficiently their scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III (PPVT-III) from initial to second administration of the test to warrant reclassification to a higher level.	At least 50% of the child participants between the ages of 3 and 5 years will improve sufficiently their scores on the PPVT-III from initial to second administration of the test to warrant reclassification to a higher level.	PPVT-III	#: 125 63%	Met target. No data from previous year.	Only one program reported less than 25%; five programs reported more than 80%. Some ESL students were tested even though the test is not designed to test this type of student.
Number tested and average rating from administering the Infant/Toddler Environmental Rating Scale (ITERS).	ITERS scores will be greater than the average of the two previous years (4.6)	ITERS	#: 99  average rating: 4.72	Target met. Three of seven reporting locations met or exceeded the target.	
Average Infant/Toddler Environmental Rating Scale (ITERS) rating in 2002-2003 minus average ITERS rating in 2001-2002.	Programs offering services will improve on the programs overall average from the previous year.	ITERS	difference: .12	Target met.	

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target or Standards</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
Number tested and average rating from administering the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R).	ECERS-R scores will be greater than the average of the two previous years (4.45)	ECERS-R	#: 148 average rating: 5.46	Target met. Six of nine reporting locations exceeded the target.	
Average Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS-R) rating in 2002-2003 minus average ECERS-R rating in 2001-2002	Programs offering services will improve on the program's overall average from the previous year.	ECERS-R	difference: .96	Target met.	
Number and percentage of children increasing their ability to read on grade level.	Measurable progress in ability to read as reported by parents.	Even Start parents' assessment of their children's reading readiness and school performance survey	#: 172 88% (no previous year data)	No target set beyond showing progress. Five of six reporting locations indicated 100%.	Relies on parent accountability and cooperation to obtain valid data.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target or Standards</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
Number and percentage of children improving school attendance.	Improvement in attendance.	Even Start parents' assessment of their children's reading readiness and school performance survey	#: 268 99%  previous year 98%	No target set but virtually all improved.	Relies on parent accountability and cooperation to obtain valid data.
Number and percentage more school age children promoted compared to 2001-2002.	Improvement in the percentage of students promoted to the next grade	Even Start parents' assessment of their children's reading readiness and school performance survey	#: 68 96%  previous year 86%	Improvement noted from the previous year. Data reported for three locations.	Relies on parent accountability and cooperation to obtain valid data.
Number and percentage of adults making progress on child-parent interaction using the Parent Child Relationship Checklist.	Measurable progress noted by staff on parent-child interaction.	Parent Child Relationship Checklist	#: 232 72%	No target set. No data from previous year. Four locations reported 100%.	Relies on staff accountability and cooperation to obtain valid data.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target or Standards</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
Number and percentage of families who participated for a minimum of 9 months.	50% of enrolled families will participate for a minimum of 9 months	Months participated	#: 166 47%  previous year 51%	Target not met. A wide range of different percentages, from 100% to 12%. At least two programs did not have a full nine months to participate.	Results are very similar to the previous year. Adults leave the program due to work or family obligations.
Number and percentage of adult participants involved for at least 160 hours.	50% of adults will participate in program activities for at least 160 hours.	Hours participated	#: 225 50%  previous year 44%	Target met. Improvement noted from the previous year. A wide range of percentages were reported, from 100% to 23%.	Improved programs for adults to increase attendance.
Number and percentage of children involved for at least 250 hours.	50% of children will participate in program activities for at least 250 hours.	Hours participated	#: 255 51%  previous year 44%	Target met. Improvement noted from the previous year.	Improved programs for children to increase attendance.

### C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State.

Indicator	Target	Measure	Cohort	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
A. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading.	At least 75% will show significant improvement and/or 50% will improve one grade level.	Tests of Adult Basic Education	232	163 70%	While target was not met, results were very similar to previous year and nearly met goal. Clearly significant gains for most adults.	Several new projects experienced difficulty organizing activities and keeping attendance high for a sufficient time period to allow an impact.
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics.	At least 75% will show significant improvement and/or 50% will improve one grade level.	Tests of Adult Basic Education	238	173 73%	While target was not met, results were very similar to previous year and nearly met goal. Clearly significant gains for most adults.	Several new projects experienced difficulty organizing activities and keeping attendance high for a sufficient time period to allow an impact.
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition.	No target set. Participation in activities and improvement in English language.	Attendance rates and acquisition of language.	31	22 71%	No previous data. Current year results very encouraging.	There is a low number of ESL adults in the cohort. Participation and improvement are not standardized.

Indicator	Target	Measure	Cohort	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED certificate.	No target set.	Obtaining a high school diploma or GED certificate.	110	22 20%	Significant improvement from previous years (2001-2002: 15%).	Achievement of this goal is directly related to the percentages of adults who stay in the program. Much more achievement of diplomas than GED.
E. Number and percentage of non-school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED certificate.	No target set.	Obtaining a high school diploma or GED certificate.	183	32 17%	Improvement from the previous year. (2001-2002: 14%)	Achievement of this goal is directly related to the percentages of adults who stay in the program. Much more achievement of diplomas than GED.

Indicator	Target	Measure	Cohort	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.	At least 50% of the child participants between the ages of 3 and 5 years will improve their scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test III (PPVT-III) from initial to second administration of the test to warrant reclassification to a higher level.	PPVT-III	51	36 71%	Target met. No data from previous year.	Inclusion of ESL students reduced the percentage.
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness.	Improvement in reading readiness.	Various measures of reading readiness	60	58 97%	No data from previous year. Very high percentage.	Small number of children limits conclusions. Relies on accountability of programs to obtain accurate information.



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level.	No target.	Even Start parents' assessment of their children's reading readiness and school performance survey	25	22 88%	No comparison with previous years. High percentage.	Small number of school-aged children limits conclusions. Depends on the accuracy of parental reporting.
I. Percentage of parents who showed improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school, environment, and through interactive learning activities.	Showing improvement on measures of parental support.	Parent child relationship checklist	234	210 89%	No comparison with previous years. Very high percentage.	Relies on parent accountability and cooperation to obtain accurate data.

<b>III. Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)</b>
---

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C, program.

**General Data Reporting Information**

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The reporting period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I, States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	153	266	206	283	201	122	122	115	112	106	80	83	56	37	16	6	823	2787
<b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	28	107	1	21	35	29	24	26	25	17	10	7	6	6	1	0	134	490
<b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	*	1	71	61	80	40	43	47	51	63	35	53	35	20	10	1	0	611
<b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	*	0	4	4	4	5	3	2	5	12	3	1	4	2	2	0	0	51
<b>E. MOBILITY</b>																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	88	202	132	161	143	119	118	99	95	87	70	70	59	36	17	12	310	1818
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	57	108	74	84	70	62	61	59	49	49	46	46	47	38	29	9	87	975

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	8	34	31	43	43	43	44	38	28	33	25	22	16	21	10	2	18	459
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	153	344	237	288	256	224	223	186	172	169	141	138	122	95	56	23	415	3242

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION</b> -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			
1.	Dropped out of school										*	*	4	1	1	2	0		8
2.	Obtained GED																		0
<b>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</b> -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																			

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

### INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III G. asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through any Schoolwide programs (SWP), even if they combined MEP funds, in any row of this table.*

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child.)

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b>																			
1. Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)		126	217	390	203	326	239	207	221	191	166	193	138	112	87	43	7	875	3741
2. Priority for Service		0	66	57	29	30	24	27	25	25	24	24	18	19	17	14	0	0	399
3. Continuation of Service		3	41	15	26	31	23	25	28	21	18	17	5	11	14	7	2	2	289
4. Any Instructional Service		0	67	390	203	326	239	207	221	191	166	193	138	112	87	43	7	117	2707
5. Reading Instruction		0	27	90	74	106	64	64	54	35	37	23	17	21	13	3	2	0	630
6. Mathematics Instruction		0	14	64	57	81	47	50	52	29	34	14	25	20	12	4	2	0	505
7. High School Credit Accrual													138	112	87	43	7	0	387
8. Any Support Service		46	83	45	43	50	44	36	33	34	33	27	22	21	16	3	3	449	988
9. Counseling Service		0	21	66	57	83	56	56	47	48	52	45	44	30	27	7	4	40	683
10. Any Referred Service		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

### INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.



TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																			
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)		41	234	75	118	162	117	100	90	74	91	66	52	50	34	25	2	343	1674
2. Priority for Service		0	10	71	18	27	29	15	11	10	12	10	7	3	1	0	0	143	367
3. Continuation of Service		0	15	0	2	5	12	8	4	6	10	7	7	10	12	13	0	11	122
4. Any Instructional Service		0	234	75	118	162	117	100	90	74	91	66	52	50	34	25	2	43	1333
5. Reading Instruction		0	73	41	73	69	52	43	43	30	35	25	12	7	4	2	0	0	508
6. Mathematics Instruction		0	69	50	73	66	47	40	38	28	32	20	11	4	2	0	0	0	480
7. High School Credit Accrual													52	50	34	25	0	0	161
8. Any Support Service		0	234	75	118	162	117	100	90	74	91	66	52	50	34	25	2	343	1633
9. Counseling Service		0	26	10	4	14	9	7	13	9	15	7	8	9	6	3	0	12	152
10. Any Referred Service		*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*Virginia does not collect these data.

### INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 142	b. 973
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT**

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *Schoolwide* Program schools that were supported with MEP funds in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 42	b. 237
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 0	b. 0
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 113	b. 1,962

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL**

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* (FTE) staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *Schoolwide* Programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = <u>45</u> Days
1. State Director	a. 0.00	b. 0.00
2. Teachers	a. 5.29	b. 16.58
3. Counselors	a. 0.00	b. 0.00
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 6.00	b. 11.25
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 3.50	b. 6.00
6. Recruiters	a. 0.25	b. 4.00
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 2.10	b. 1.10

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.

<p><b>V. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)</b></p>
--

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

## **VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)**

In the September 2003, Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development;” and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology  
(Title II, Part D)**

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore, performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.



## **VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)**

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

**1.** A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).

**2.** English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

A. The ELP baseline data included the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
  - Describe how the composite score was derived;
  - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
  - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

**3.** Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

**4.** Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

**5.** Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. In September 2003, States provided performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

## **IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)**

### **General Instructions**

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, “physical fighting”) should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If your State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

**A.** In the following chart, please identify each of your State indicators as submitted by the State in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:

- a. The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
- b. The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
- c. 2002-2003 baseline data
- d. Targets for the years in which your State has established targets

### **Definition of “physical fighting”**

Fighting with injury – Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence, where there is serious injury; requires medical attention and may include, but not be limited to the following: a bullet wound, a stab, or puncture wound, fractured or broken bones, concussion, cuts requiring stitches.

Fighting without injury – Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence, where there is no or minor injury; may include, but not be limited to the following: scrape on body (e.g., knee, elbow, hand, etc., minor bruising).

### **Definition of “weapons”**

Any weapon that will, is designed to, or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. Includes firearms of any kind (operable or inoperable, loaded or unloaded) such as, but not limited to, hand, zip, pistol, rifle, shotgun, starter gun, and flare gun. Category includes look-a-like weapons if not used in compliance with local policy.

(Source – Annual Report: Discipline, Crime, and Violence: School Year 2002-2003: Virginia Department of Education, April 2004)

## A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002- 2003 Baseline	Targets**
1. The percentage of students who carried a gun to school or school event during a given school year	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Annually	.00441%	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
2. The percentage of students who engaged in a physical fight on school property	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Annually	2.46018%	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
3. The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property*	Discipline, Crime, and Violence report for the state	Annually	.24345%	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
				2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
				2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
				2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
				2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007

## A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).

\* The Department of Education does not conduct a statewide youth survey. Proxy measures are being employed using currently collected data.

\*\*2002-2003 baseline data was finalized as of June 1, 2004. Targets for 2003-2007 have not been determined. The targets, based on 2002-2003 data, will be brought to the Virginia State Board of Education for adoption in September 2004.

**B.** In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

**1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	4,711	132
Middle	12,237	132
High School	7,686	132

**2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	426	132
Middle	712	132
High School	616	132

**3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	8	132
Middle	225	132
High School	745	132

**4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	73	132
Middle	930	132
High School	2,013	132

The definition of “elementary school” involves grades K-5; “middle school” involves grades 6-8; and “high school” involves grades 9-12.

**C. Describe the outcomes of the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.**

**KIDsafe Virginia**

A centerpiece of Virginia's efforts to inform and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts has been the KIDsafe Virginia initiative, and specifically the KIDsafe Virginia parent guides. Over 245,000 Virginia parents have received these guides. The Parent Guide to Personal Safety for Children provides parents of elementary age students with tips on discussing safety issues with children, strategies for helping children stay safe, information about what children can do to stay safe, what to do in an emergency, and additional related resources for parents. The Parent Guide to Personal Safety for Children is keyed to and complements a 10-lesson personal safety curriculum for students in Grades K - 4 that is designed to be taught by a law enforcement or public safety professional. The Parent Guide to Crime Prevention for Teens provides parents with approaches to communicate effectively with teens, crime prevention tips, strategies for teens to use to avoid alcohol and other drugs and related risks, and additional related resources for parents of teens. The Parent Guide to Crime Prevention for Teens is keyed to and complements a 6-lesson crime prevention curriculum for high school students that is designed to be taught by a school resource officer. Both of these parent guides and the related curricula can be downloaded from <http://www.gosap.state.va.us/kidsafeva.htm/>

Feedback from parents, although limited, has been strongly positive and has provided evidence of increased knowledge of strategies parents can use to reduce the likelihood of their children being injured or becoming victims of crime.

Additional components of the KIDsafe Virginia initiative that engaged parents in drug and violence prevention efforts were as follows:

KIDsafe Virginia Mailbox - An online "suggestion box" that can be used by students, parents and other citizens to recommend strategies for enhancing safety and security of youth in schools and communities throughout Virginia. The mailbox is at [www.vasafeschools.com](http://www.vasafeschools.com)

Make-the-Call Hotline - Using a toll-free number, students (as well as parents and other citizens) can anonymously report conditions that they believe could potentially threaten the safety and security of their schools and communities. The number is 1-866-SAFE-VA-1 or 1-866-723-3821.

KIDsafe Virginia Identification Kits - DNA kits have been distributed to parents who will voluntarily gather DNA for use in the event a child is missing. Parents maintain custody of the DNA to help investigators if the need arises. Over 100,000 kits have been disseminated through a partnership with the Virginia Automobile Dealers Association and through law enforcement agencies and public events.

Internet Safety Awareness Lessons - Parent-oriented Internet safety sessions are taught as a component of the I-Safe America curriculum for students in grades 5 through 8. The program teaches students to safely and responsibly take control of their Internet experience, to recognize and avoid dangers, and to respond appropriately.

### **Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSCA) Program**

Each LEA, as part of the Title IV, SDFSCA application, is required to describe the process used to include parents in the development of the application and in the ongoing administration of the SDFSCA program. Virginia LEAs use a variety of methods to fulfill this requirement including parent representation on local health advisory councils, school safety teams, and community prevention councils. For the school year 2002-2003, five additional LEAs report parent education programming (from 83 LEAs in 2001-02 to 88 in 2002-03). Additionally, the number of LEAs reporting parent involvement in programming increased from 90 to 96 in the same one-year period.

A primary source of information for Virginia parents since 1998 has been School Performance Report Cards. These report cards provide information on student achievement, accreditation, safety, attendance, dropout rates, graduation rates, and professional qualifications of teachers for the state as a whole and for individual schools. School safety incident data posted for every school in Virginia include the following:

- Fights (without and with injury)
- Firearm Violations
- Other Weapons

School Performance Report Cards are available on the Virginia Department of Education Web site at <http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/src/>.

Supporting general school efforts to engage parents is the Virginia Department of Education's publication Collaborative Family-School Relationships for Children's Learning, developed to provide an overview of how educators can develop productive family-school relationships that promote student learning. The publication, based on sound research, includes a comprehensive list of strategies for involving parents and for reaching uninvolved families.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers  
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.



## **XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)**

**A.** Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A, funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

Activities supported by Title V, Part A, state-level funds to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students have been broad-based. These activities focused on all grade levels of Virginia's students, beginning with pre-kindergarten students up to high school seniors and included students with limited English proficiency. A description and results of the activities are provided below.

### **Pre-Kindergarten Focus**

The funds were used to continue the development and printing of the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening for Preschool (PALS-PreK). This screening is a measure of young children's knowledge of important emergent literacy fundamentals. PALS-PreK provides a direct means for matching early literacy instruction to specific literacy needs and a means of monitoring a child's emerging control in these literacy areas.

The use of PALS-PreK helps teachers focus their instruction on specific literacy skills that preschoolers need to learn. A gain score was determined by subtracting the average sum score for the fall assessment from the average sum score for the spring assessment. This resulted in an average statewide gain score of 30 points. Thus this assessment helped students increase their early literacy skills.

Over 650 teachers (public and private) and over 9,100 children (public and private) were involved in PALS-Pre-K instruction.

### **Limited English Proficient Students**

Virginia is one of seventeen states participating in a consortium to develop an English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) for third through twelfth grade limited English proficient (LEP) students. Title V funds were used to fund the state share of development costs for the kindergarten through second grade component of the ELDA. The estimated number of students that will potentially be impacted by the award is 21,000. The Title V funds will provide student level assessment results based on student performance on the ELDA.

### **Schools to Watch Program**

The Virginia Middle School Association (VMSA), in collaboration with the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), submitted an application to participate in the innovative "Schools to Watch" (STW) program of the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform. In 2003 Virginia was accepted as one of four new states to participate in the program. The program serves to identify and recognize middle schools that are making substantial progress in meeting the academic and social needs of the student body. These schools then serve as sites others can visit to see certain promising practices being implemented. The state program has completed its first cycle in the Schools to Watch process and has identified four outstanding middle-level schools that meet the STW criteria, have attained full state accreditation based on academic achievement in four core areas, and met all AYP targets.

Title V, Part A, funds were used to support the training process for twenty-five reviewer-facilitators in September 2003. Additionally, funds were used to support some of the site-visit reviewer expenses in the final selection of the four middle schools. The student population of the four selected schools exceeds 5,000 students, and indirectly, the program will have impact on middle instruction throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia.

#### **2+4 in 2004...and 2005 and 2006 Brochure**

Student and parent outreach was an essential element of the Commonwealth of Virginia's successful effort to raise standards for high school graduation. In the fall of 2003, the Department of Education's Division of Policy and Communications designed an attractive three-color brochure explaining the requirements students in the graduating classes of 2004, 2005, and 2006 would have to meet to earn a Standard, Advanced Studies, or Modified Standard Diploma. The brochure was distributed in January 2003 to the 300 high schools in the state in numbers sufficient to provide a brochure for every junior, sophomore, and freshman. The press run of 275,000 also allowed for requests for extra brochures from high schools, the state's 304 middle schools and from community-based organizations. The brochure was reprinted in the fall of 2003 in response to requests from school divisions. This second run included 280,000 brochures, which were distributed to all Virginia high schools. Principals and guidance counselors reported that the brochure was an effective tool for raising awareness of the commonwealth's graduation requirements among students and parents. This is especially important this year because this year's graduating class, and subsequent classes must earn at least six verified credits by passing certain courses and the accompanying Standards of Learning (SOL) tests.

#### **Governor's Regional Summer Academies**

In the spring of 2003, Governor Warner introduced Project Graduation, an effort devised to assist students graduating in 2004 in earning required standard and verified credits. The Governor's Regional Summer Academies were a pilot project designed to help rising seniors who passed the required English courses for graduation but who needed assistance in passing the English SOL tests. An intensive remediation program in Algebra I was also piloted. Chesterfield County Public Schools and the Department of Education partnered with eleven Southside Virginia school divisions to pilot an English SOL summer remediation program. Participating divisions included Amelia, Brunswick, Buckingham, Charlotte, Cumberland, Greenville, Halifax, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Nottoway, and Prince Edward. The Academies were offered at three sites in the region: Prince Edward County High School, Randolph Henry Senior High School (Charlotte County), and the Brunswick Technical Center (Brunswick County). The results of the pilot program are represented in the tables below.

The results for the administrations of the English/Reading and Algebra I tests are reflected in the table below.

Academy Site	<i>English: Reading</i>			<i>Algebra I</i>			<i>English: Reading and Algebra I</i>		
	No. Students Enrolled	No. Students Passing	% Pass Rate	No. Students Enrolled	No. Students Passing	% Pass Rate	No. Students Enrolled	No. Students Passing	% Pass Rate
Brunswick (County) Technical Center	10	6	60	10	9	90	20	15	75
Randolph Henry High School (Charlotte Co.)	2	2	100	9	8	89	11	10	91
Prince Edward (County) High School	7	5	71	4	4	100	11	9	82
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>81</b>

Note: Two students who did not pass the Algebra I test dropped out after they did not pass the test on July 11, 2003.

The English: Writing assessment was administered on July 21-23, 2003. The results are as follows:

Academy Site	<b>English: Writing</b>		
	<b>No. Students Enrolled</b>	<b>No. Students Passing</b>	<b>% Pass Rate</b>
Brunswick (County) Technical Center	15	4	27%
Randolph Henry High School (Charlotte County)	8	5	63%
Prince Edward (County) High School	17	5	29%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35%</b>

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A, funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including:** (1) student achievement in reading and mathematics; (2) teacher quality; (3) safe and drug free schools; (4) access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>	Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A, (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>	101	20	848,061
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	17	3	218,016
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	6	0	13,210
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	35	4	83,099
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A, purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A, under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

**B.1** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A, funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A, funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. 2

**B.2** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. 21

<sup>1</sup> In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)  
(Title VI, Part B)**

**A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)**

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.

4

**B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)**

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Number of LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	14
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	20
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	19
Parental involvement activities	14
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	12
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	19
Activities authorized under Title III (Language Instruction for LEP and Immigrant Students)	6

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Virginia maintains one statewide accountability system. Schools and school divisions that meet the annual measurable objectives required by the No Child Left Behind legislation are considered to have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of 100 percent proficiency of all students in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014. During the 2002-2003 school year, 13.6 percent of the school divisions in Virginia made AYP. Forty-three of the 132 school divisions in Virginia received Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 Funds. Six of the 43 divisions, or 13.9 percent, made AYP.

<b><i>XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)</i></b> <b><i>Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2</i></b> <b><i>Rural and Low-Income School Program</i></b> <b><i>2002-2003</i></b>			
<b>School Divisions</b>	<b>School Division's AYP Status</b>	<b>Number of Title I Schools</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I Schools Making AYP</b>
Accomack County	Did not make AYP	4	0%
Brunswick County	Did not make AYP	4	25%
Buchana County	Did not make AYP	6	33%
Buckingham County	Made AYP	4	100%
Buena Vista City	Made AYP	2	100%
Carroll County	Did not make AYP	7	57%
Charlotte County	Made AYP	3	100%
Covington City	Did not make AYP	2	100%
Cumberland County	Did not make AYP	1	100%
Dickenson County	Did not make AYP	5	80%
Essex County	Did not make AYP	2	0%
Franklin City	Did not make AYP	2	50%
Galax City	Did not make AYP	1	100%
Grayson County	Did not make AYP	6	50%
Greensville County	Did not make AYP	3	33%
Halifax County	Did not make AYP	11	36%
King and Queen County	Did not make AYP	2	100%
Lancaster County	Did not make AYP	1	100%
Lee County	Did not make AYP	11	91%
Lunenburg County	Did not make AYP	2	50%
Martinsville City	Did not make AYP	4	75%
Mecklenburg County	Did not make AYP	7	57%
Middlesex County	Did not make AYP	1	0%
Northampton County	Did not make AYP	2	50%
Northumberland County	Did not make AYP	1	0%
Norton City	Made AYP	1	100%
Nottoway County	Did not make AYP	4	0%
Patrick County	Did not make AYP	6	100%
Prince Edward County	Did not make AYP	3	33%
Pulaski County	Did not make AYP	5	100%
Richmond County	Did not make AYP	2	50%
Russell County	Did not make AYP	9	78%
Smyth County	Made AYP	7	100%
Southampton County	Did not make AYP	4	25%
Staunton City	Made AYP	4	100%
Surry County	Did not make AYP	2	50%
Sussex County	Did not make AYP	3	66%
Tazewell County	Did not make AYP	9	78%
Waynesboro City	Did not make AYP	3	66%
Westmoreland County	Did not make AYP	2	0%
Winchester City	Did not make AYP	4	100%
Wise County	Did not make AYP	6	84%
Wythe County	Did not make AYP	6	66%

<b>XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)</b>
---

**A. State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year?     No    

**B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds**

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year.     5
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	0	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	2	\$119,235.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	1	\$5,631.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	2	\$43,534.76
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	1	\$18,475.29

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	3	\$175,280.29
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	2	\$11,595.76
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*